

# HORSE IN A RESTAURANT. Goes in Through Plate Glass Win- dow and Wrecks the Place.

Several customers in the restaurant of Peter Sebek, at No. 217 Havemeyer-st., Williamsburg, were busy at their meals last evening when there was a crash of glass that sounded like an explosion, and a horse landed in the place and brought up against the cashier's desk. The young woman who had been perched on the stool behind the desk was knocked into a corner. She soon got to her feet, and then, with the waiters and customers following her, made a dash for the kitchen.

The horse was a bay, belonging to Charles Kirchner & Son, dealers in artificial stone work, whose offices are in the Germania Bank Building, Bowers and Spring streets, Manhattan, and whose warehouses are at No. 348 Pavonia-ave., Jersey City. The animal had a record of 2:20. It was driven by Charles Kirchner, jr., who is a member of the firm and a nephew of former Police Captain Kirchner. There was another man with him. The two had been to East New-York and were on their way to Jersey City. As they turned into Havemeyer-st. from Broadway the horse was seized with an attack of blind staggers and overturned the light wagon, throwing Kirchner and his companion to the street.

Thousands of persons on their way home from Manhattan were in the neighborhood of the bridge plaza at the time, and a large crowd soon gathered. As soon as he was free the animal began to run blindly about the street, with the shafts pounding against his heels. The people became as wild as the horse, and ran in all directions screaming to escape.

The horse soon turned its attention to the restaurant, which is in the basement, and getting a good start, slid on his side across the pavement and plunged through the window. All those in the restaurant escaped safely to the kitchen except the proprietor's son. Before he could reach the door the animal was upon him. He yelled for those in the kitchen to open the door. The proprietor's cousin cautiously opened it, and young Sebek slipped into the room. Before the door could be closed again, however, the horse had stuck his head through and grabbed the proprietor's cousin by the shoulder, inflicting a severe wound.

The horse, now in sole possession of the restaurant, ran from one end to the other, overturning chairs and tables. He ran against a large sideboard that stood in the rear of the room and toppled it over, and a large mirror standing at the side of the room was reduced to fragments, with the water cooler and cash register's desk were soon unrecognizable. In front of the place the crowd had become so large that a call was sent for the reserves of the Bedford-ave. station. A dozen patrolmen established their about the restaurant and began to puzzle how to get the horse out. The animal worked the problem by running out the front door. It fell when it reached the steps leading to the sidewalk and lay there for a moment. The animal had been badly cut by the plate glass and Roundman Lyons, in charge, decided to shoot it.

The first shot hit the horse in the shoulder. It scrambled to its feet and rushed into the street. There was another scattering of the crowd, but the animal now had become so weak from the loss of blood that he soon fell and, as a bullet from Lyons's revolver ended the animal's misery.

# HORSES ON THE RAMPADE.

## Three Persons Seriously Injured in Brooklyn Runaways.

There were four runaways in Brooklyn yesterday afternoon within a few minutes. Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Green, of No. 51 Lafayette-ave., were driving in their victoria. At Hanson Place and St. Felix-st. the horse became unmanageable. Peter McMahon, the driver, of No. 27 Prospect Place, did his best to turn the horse down a side street, as he was making a dash for the subway obstruction at Flatbush-ave. His efforts were unsuccessful, and at Flatbush-ave. the victor was thrown into an elevated railroad pillar and was smashed. Mrs. Green was thrown violently against a pile of timbers and knocked insensate. She was attended by Dr. William Martin, of Hanson Place, who took her home in a cab. She was found to be suffering from wounds on the head and body, and had three ribs fractured. It was said that her condition was somewhat improved last night. Mr. Green's right leg was fractured.

McMahon, the driver, whose skull was fractured, was taken to the Brooklyn Hospital. He is not expected to live.

George Gans, twenty-two years old, of No. 707 Amsterdam-ave., Manhattan, received a compound fracture of the left arm by being thrown out of his seat when he was driving a horse into a light when he was removed to the Brooklyn Hospital. The horse was frightened by an automobile and ran two blocks before Gans was able to get control of the animal, which was caught at Gates-ave. and Fulton-st.

Charles Kirchner, of the Bowers and Spring-st. restaurant, was driving a horse into a light when he was removed to the Brooklyn Hospital. The horse was frightened by an automobile and ran two blocks before Gans was able to get control of the animal, which was caught at Gates-ave. and Fulton-st.

Left unattended in front of the Thomas Jefferson Hotel, No. 44 Degraw-st., took fright and dashed down the street. He narrowly missed striking several trolleys and was finally captured by a man on the street. The damage to the restaurant is estimated at \$200.

Left unattended in front of the Thomas Jefferson Hotel, No. 44 Degraw-st., took fright and dashed down the street. He narrowly missed striking several trolleys and was finally captured by a man on the street. The damage to the restaurant is estimated at \$200.

# ACID ON HORSE'S HOOF.

## Merchant Overcome at Loss of Animal He Would Not Sell.

The Delancey-st. station police are working hard to find the man who some time last week poured some powerful acid on the hoofs of Louis Solomon's bay horse, named for his master, who lives at No. 206 Broome-st. A week ago Solomon, who is a merchant, refused an offer of \$250 for the horse, which was his principal asset in business. The next day the horse was suddenly lame in the right hind leg, and he was taken to the Veterinary Hospital in an ambulance.

A veterinary surgeon said that the horse's hoofs were fast decomposing owing to the action of some powerful acid.

"Better shoot him," he said.

"What? Shoot my horse? He is worth \$250!" exclaimed Solomon, beside himself at his ill fortune. "I'll give you ten cents for him," said the surgeon, turning to his next patient. "I'll give you ten cents for him," said the surgeon, turning to his next patient.

# WEST BROADWAY CLUB RAIDED.

## Two Prisoners and Much Paraphernalia Taken—Axe Breaks Down Door.

The Police Club, which the police say is owned and run by the Steedeker building, on the second floor of a West Broadway building, was raided at 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon and twenty-six men were found in the place.

The police took all their names and addresses, and allowed all to go free but two whom they took to the Church-st. police station and locked up on the charge of aiding and abetting the keeping of a poolroom.

The men locked up were Leon Steedeker, who said he was a clerk, of Bath Beach, and Thomas E. Steedeker, of No. 333 Broadway.

A telegraph instrument, telephone, racing cards and sheets and "dope" book, poker chips, playing cards and other paraphernalia were confiscated and taken to the police station in a patrol wagon along with the prisoners.

None was named by Detectives Beardon and Cunningham, of the Church-st. station, and Lloyd and Johnson and others of Egan's squad. Admitted and refused and an axe was used to break down the door.

# WILL SUE FOR DOG.

## Herman Bolte to Bring Action Against Mr. Tuttle.

Speaking for her husband, former Justice Herman Bolte, of White Plains, Mr. Bolte said last night that he would take action at once to recover the Japanese spaniel taken from his lawn Sunday afternoon by Frederick W. Tuttle, a manufacturer living at No. 288 W. 42nd-st. The question to be decided is, who has the prior right to the dog. We believe that we can prove our right to it. If the gentleman who took it from our lawn can prove it is his we will not dispute his right to it. We have had the dog about two years, and got it from a person whom we believe to be reliable. Who that person is will be made known when action is taken.

The spaniel was taken from Mr. Bolte's lawn in a manner slightly short of daring. Mr. Bolte remarked afterward that only a whirling dervish could have done that. He was sitting on his porch, a book in his hand and a cigar in his mouth. Mr. Bolte was standing at his master's side, and then casting a condescending look at his master, Mr. Bolte was absorbed in his book, when a huge, dark, shaggy animal came to him and he looked over his glasses, did not recognize any one, and picked up the thread of the story he was reading.

"Just look at that dog, sweet little dog! Isn't he a darling?" said one of the party.

The former judge lifted his eyes from his book at the sound of the words. He looked at the dog. He liked to hear other people praise his dog. He shook his head approvingly, then became interested in the dog. He was looking at the dog when two women and three men, Mr. Tuttle was one of them, came to him. He was looking at the dog when two women and three men, Mr. Tuttle was one of them, came to him. He was looking at the dog when two women and three men, Mr. Tuttle was one of them, came to him.

# CRASH IN FIRE RACE.

## Companies in Collision Responding to False Alarm.

While the Hoboken fire was burning last night some one turned in a false alarm from Washington and Clarkson sts. This is an important fact, and in addition to several pieces of land apparatus which responded two fireboats were sent out. Chief Crook, who was in command of the fireboat, was without foundation, and on the arrival of the chief he learned that another alarm had been turned in from Bleeker and Grove sts.

Accordingly he dispatched Engine Company No. 24 to that fire. The company went at a rapid rate to the scene. When the heavy engine arrived at Bedford-st., in Barrow-st., it ran into the second company of Engine No. 24, which had been to the scene and which was on its way home. The impact carried the engines over to the southeast corner, and the horses became wedged in the doorway of a saloon kept by Horrida. The fireboat was standing in the doorway at the time, and was knocked down and received severe injuries. He was seriously hurt, and the fireboat was damaged. Both horses of Engine No. 24 were cut and one of them on Engine No. 24. None of the fireboat's crew were hurt, and no damage was done to the steamers.

# ENTERED HIS FATHER'S HOUSE.

## Young Man Taken by Watchman Has to Prove Identity in Court.

Frank Rockwell, charged with breaking into the house of Lucius A. Rockwell, a well-to-do machinery manufacturer, of No. 715 East 174th-st., proved in the Morrisania police court yesterday that he was the son of Lucius A. Rockwell, and had merely sought shelter in the house, which is now untenanted, the family being in the country. The prisoner admitted that he was not on good terms with his father. Magistrate Barlow discharged him.

When the elder Rockwell went to the country he asked a watchman to watch the house. When the watchman saw a light in the house he entered, and found Frank Rockwell preparing to retire. Though the young man protested that he was the son of the owner of the house, Barlow locked him up.

# BROKE LEG ONLY IN LONG FALL.

## Boy Plunged Four Stories Down Ventilator Shaft and Was Not Badly Hurt.

Samuel Kupperman, aged ten, of No. 60 Hester-st., got off with only a broken leg and a few bruises from a fall of four stories down a ventilator shaft at Public School No. 42, Hester and Orchard sts. An evening playground is run at the school by the recreation bureau of the Department of Education. Thursday evening Kupperman was playing hide-and-go-seek with other youngsters of his age on the playground. He picked out the top of the ventilator shaft as a good place to hide and climbed upon it, but lost his balance and fell.

Frank S. Smith, an expert in athletic work, volunteered to descend into the shaft for the boy on a rope. Mrs. Kupperman arrived and waited patiently for the recovery of her child. Three firemen from Hook and Ladder Company No. 6 also came with ropes.

Smith went down into the shaft and found the boy four stories below and two stories from the ground. There he had lodged in a turn of the shaft. He took off the rope and sent the boy up ahead.

Meanwhile, an ambulance had been summoned from Gouverneur Hospital. Dr. Schmidt found that the child had a broken leg and a number of bruises, but apparently was in no danger of dying.

# SAT UP WITH SHOTGUN FOR THREE.

## Pastor Objected to Being Called a "Chump" by Man Who Stole Books.

Orient, Long Island, Aug. 7.—The Rev. John A. Gray, of the Congregational Church of this place, sat up all except two nights last week waiting for a thief who has paid two visits to the parsonage, and on the last one left a note saying that the pastor was a "chump." The note is supposed to have referred to the fact that, though robbed only a few nights before, the minister left his study watch on the table last night. The watch was used to weight down the note so that the wind would not blow it away.

The first visit was on July 25. That night the thief took Dr. Gray's diploma, his sheepskin reciting his elevation to the doctorate, and seven other books. Last Tuesday night he took fifteen more books. Ever since Dr. Gray has sat up nights with a shotgun waiting for the third visit.

# TALK OF NEW OFFICE BUILDING.

## Creation of Gas and Electricity Commission Revives Plan in Albany.

Albany, Aug. 7.—Governor Higgins returned this morning from his home at Olean. He expects to remain until to-morrow night. Plans for his vacation in a separate structure built for the purpose. This plan has been discussed before, but the creation of a new additional State office and board by the last legislature has made the need of more room imperative.

Weighted with a stone weighing about fifty pounds that was fastened with wire about his waist, the body of a middle-aged man was found yesterday in the North River at Depot Lane, near Port Washington Point. The police of the West 32d-st. station believe that the man committed suicide. The body was found in the water more than a week. The police found the water more than a week. The police found the water more than a week. The police found the water more than a week.

# DEAD MAN WEIGHTED WITH STONE.

## Police Find Body Off Port Washington Point.

Weighted with a stone weighing about fifty pounds that was fastened with wire about his waist, the body of a middle-aged man was found yesterday in the North River at Depot Lane, near Port Washington Point. The police of the West 32d-st. station believe that the man committed suicide. The body was found in the water more than a week. The police found the water more than a week. The police found the water more than a week. The police found the water more than a week.

# VIGILANTES SHOOT AT POLICE.

## East New-Yorkers Think Everything in Sight Is a Burglar Nowadays.

On account of the operations of a gang of desperate burglars in the Arlington section of East New-York Brooklyn, a vigilance committee has been organized by Harry A. Mandeville, of No. 78 Schenck-ave.

"I am not fond of taking life," he said yesterday, "and I do not believe that my neighbors are blood-thirsty, but we have made up our minds to put an end to burglaries, and we will shoot to kill. The only good burglars are dead burglars."

No less than twelve burglaries and attempted burglaries within a radius of five blocks were reported to the police of the Liberty-ave. station in forty-eight hours. Every resident has bought a shotgun and laid in a stock of ammunition. He is dying to try his hand on a burglar, and it is dangerous to be seen lurking in the neighborhood. At 2 o'clock yesterday morning two policemen, detailed to hunt for burglars, were fired at by an over-zealous citizen. In a minute there was great excitement. Detectives came running up from various directions, and as they ran citizens, sitting up for a chance to pop a burglar took a shot at them. It was wonderful that no one was injured before the situation was straightened out.

# TRY TO GET LICENSE AT ASSURY.

## To Adopt Ordinance to Test Constitutionality of "One Mile" Law.

Asbury Park, N. J., Aug. 7.—Samuel A. Patterson, the city attorney, is of the opinion that the legislative act of 1902 empowering all cities to create an elective excise board is a repealer of the act of 1896, forbidding the sale of liquor within one mile of any camp meeting resort.

This was brought out at to-night's meeting of the Common Council, when a motion was adopted empowering the drafting of an ordinance providing for the election of an excise board at the next election in November. Frank Appleby, the president, said that the only way to get the law repealed was to have an informal special election should first be held. This was agreed to by the council. The ordinance was advanced until the voters pass upon the proposition. This election will probably be held next week.

Mayor Francis J. Deane, who was present, urged haste in solving the liquor problem. He said the County Court officials had notified the city officials that the excise board must be organized at once or the hotels violating the law would be raided, and hotel guests rounded up in the raid would be held as witnesses to avoid such a drastic course, he maintained that the Common Council should hasten to adopt an ordinance creating an excise board to test the constitutionality of the "One Mile Limit" act.

# TRIES TO SHIELD CHILD EMPLOYERS.

## Defence in Suits Says Foremen, Not Companies, Are to Blame.

Trenton, N. J., Aug. 7.—Novel defenses were made to-day to two suits instituted by the Attorney General for Lewis T. Bryant, Commissioner of Labor of New-Jersey, for violation of the child labor laws prohibiting the employment of children under fourteen years of age in factories of the State.

In a suit against the Mercer Pottery Company it was contended that the child was not employed by the company, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exonerated unless it could be shown that he knowingly employed a child below the legal age, and that there were no circumstances to justify a belief that it was above the age. Judge MacPherson held that this contention was without force, since the law requires that affidavits and proofs of age for all children under sixteen shall be on file with the company. Another point of the defense was that the child was not employed by the company directly, but by the foreman, who was employed by the company and the employer exoner